

File



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/577,320	05/24/2000	Nagendran Parasu	95-426	4911

23164 7590 12/08/2004
LEON R TURKEVICH
2000 M STREET NW
7TH FLOOR
WASHINGTON, DC 200363307

EXAMINER

HUTTON JR, WILLIAM D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2179

DATE MAILED: 12/08/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/577,320

Applicant(s)

PARASU, NAGENDRAN

Examiner

Doug Hutton

Art Unit

2179

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 July 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,5-7,10-13 and 16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 3,4,8,9,14 and 15 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 24 May 2000 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Applicant's Response

In Applicant's Response dated 2 July 2004, Applicant argued against all objections and rejections previously set forth in the Office Action dated 5 April 2004.

All rejections previously set forth are withdrawn.

Claim Objections

Claims 1, 6 and 16 are objected to because of the following informalities:

- in Claim 1, the phrase "storing, in response to a first HTTP request, an XML document that specifies for a user, a call number of a second party" in Lines 3-4 should be amended to — in response to a first HTTP request, storing an XML document that specifies a call number of a second party for a user — so the limitation reads more easily; Claim 16 has the same problem;
- in Claim 1, the phrase "generating a first hypertext markup language (HTML) document, based on the retrieved XML document, having instructions including the call number for accessing the second party" in Lines 7-9 should be amended to — based on the retrieved XML document, generating a first HTML document having instructions including the call number for accessing the second party — to clearly indicate that the first HTML document includes the instructions and the

XML document does not include the instructions; Claims 6 and 16 have the same problem; and

- in Claim 1, the phrase “selectively generating a second HTML document, based on a prescribed input received from the second party, having instructions for connecting the second party with the user” in Lines 10-12 should be amended to — based on a prescribed input received from the second party, selectively generating a second HTML document having instructions for connecting the second party with the user — so the limitation reads more easily; Claims 6 and 16 have the same problem.

Claim 2 is objected to because of the following informalities:

- the terms “including” in Line 3 and Line 4 should be amended to — includes — so the limitation reads more easily.

Claims 3 and 8 are objected to because of the following informalities:

- in Claim 3, the terms “respectively” in Line 3 and Line 6 should be deleted because the terms are unnecessary; Claim 8 has the same problem; and
- in Claim 3, the phrase “the method including receiving an HTTP request including the form specifying the user’s call number, the call number of the second party and the prompt sequence, respectively, in the entry field prior to the storing step” in Lines 3-6 should be amended to — wherein the user’s call number, the call number of the second party and the prompt sequence are entered into the entry

fields of the form prior to the storing step — so the limitation reads more easily.

Also, the HTTP request cannot “*include*” the form. Rather, a user can make an HTTP request *for* the form, or a user can make an HTTP request *for an HTML document* that includes the form. Claim 8 has the same problem.

Claims 4 and 9 are objected to because of the following informalities:

- the phrase “in the HTTP request” in Line 2 should be deleted because the HTTP request cannot “*include*” the form, as explained in the above discussion; Claim 9 has the same problem.

Claim 5 is objected to because of the following informalities:

- the term “playing” in Line 2 should be amended to — recording — because the voice message is recorded on the first HTML document (see *Specification* – Page 13, third paragraph, eighth sentence).

Claim 7 is objected to because of the following informalities:

- the phrase “party, the first HTML document including” in Lines 2-3 should be amended to — party and the first HTML document includes — so the limitation reads more easily.

Claim 11 is objected to because of the following informalities:

- the term “system” should be inserted between the terms “server” and “configured” in Line 1 because the preamble subsequently refers to a “system” (see Line 2).

Claim 12 is objected to because of the following informalities:

- the term “documents” in Line 3 should be amended to — document — because only one HTML document is previously mentioned in the claims (see Claim 11, Lines 3-4).

Claim 14 is objected to because of the following informalities:

- the phrase “that specifies a form having” in Line 4 should be amended to — for a form comprising entry fields for inserting — because the HTTP request cannot “include” the form, as previously explained in the above discussion; also, this form is blank and does not include any parameters until subsequent steps are performed;
- the phrase “configured for” in Line 7 should be deleted so that the limitation is positively recited;
- the phrase “generating a first hypertext markup language (HTML) document, based on the XML document, having instructions including the call number for accessing the second party” in Lines 9-11 should be amended to — based on the XML document, generating a first HTML document having instructions including the call number for accessing the second party — to clearly indicate that the first

HTML document includes the instructions and the XML document does not include the instructions; and

- the phrase “selectively generating a second HTML document, based on a prescribed input received from the second party, having instructions for connecting the second party with the user” in Lines 12-14 should be amended to — based on a prescribed input received from the second party, selectively generating a second HTML document having instructions for connecting the second party with the user — so the limitation reads more easily.

Claim 15 is objected to because of the following informalities:

- the number “13” in Line 1 should be amended to — 14 — because Claim 15 should depend from Claim 14; for purposes of examination, the examiner will assume that Claim 15 depends from Claim 14; if Claim 15 does depend from Claim 13, then the examiner directs Applicant’s attention to the following rejections for Claims 2 and 7.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 11-13 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miloslavsky et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,597,685, in view of Vange et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2002/0004796.

Claim 1:

Miloslavsky discloses a method in an application server configured for responding to hypertext transport protocol (HTTP) requests (see Figure 5; see Column 2, Line 56 through Column 3, Line 11 – Miloslavsky discloses this limitation in that every computerized method performed on the Internet is *inherently* “in an application server” that is “configured for responding to HTTP requests”), the method comprising:

- storing, in response to a first HTTP request, a document that specifies for a user, a call number of a second party (see Figures 5, 6 and 8; see Column 10, Lines 57-62; Column 11, Lines 17-36; see Column 12, Line 44 through Column 13, Line 16 – Miloslavsky discloses this limitation in that the call center system includes a server storing a document that includes the call number of the call center; this document must inherently have been placed on the server “in response to a first HTTP request” in that the website developer generated the web page that included the call center number and then published the web page by sending it to the server using HTTP);
- retrieving the stored document based on a second HTTP request by the user (see Figures 5, 6 and 8; see Column 10, Lines 57-62; Column 11, Lines 17-36; see Column 12, Line 44 through Column 13, Line 16 – Miloslavsky discloses this

limitation in that the call center system retrieves the stored web page on the server anytime a user requests access of the web page);

- generating a first hypertext markup language (HTML) document having instructions including the call number for accessing the second party (see Figures 5, 6 and 8; see Column 10, Lines 57-62; Column 11, Lines 17-36; see Column 12, Line 44 through Column 13, Line 16 – Miloslavsky discloses this limitation in that the call center system displays the web page on the user's browser; the web page includes "instructions for accessing the second party" in that the call center system will connect the user to the call center whenever the user clicks on the button); and
- selectively generating a second HTML document, based on a prescribed input received from the second party, having instructions for connecting the second party with the user (see Figures 5, 6 and 8; see Column 10, Lines 57-62; Column 11, Lines 17-36; Column 11, Lines 17-34; see Column 12, Line 44 through Column 13, Line 16; Column 14, Lines 32-64; Column 31, Lines 6-10; Column 39, Lines 25-51 – Miloslavsky discloses this limitation in that the call center system connects the user to the call center; Miloslavsky discloses "selectivity" based on "input received from the second party" in two ways: 1) the service request process determines to which agent the call is directed; and 2) the agent telephone is capable of placing a call on hold to answer another call; Miloslavsky discloses "generating a second HTML document" in that the invention may

operate via computers that simulate telephones per Internet protocol network telephony).

Miloslavsky fails to expressly disclose:

- an *XML* document that specifies for a user, a call number of a second party; and
- generating a first hypertext markup language (HTML) document, *based on the retrieved XML document*.

Vange teaches a method in an application server configured for responding to hypertext transport protocol (HTTP) requests (see Paragraphs 0027 and 0031 – Vange teaches this limitation in that every computerized method performed on the Internet is *inherently* “in an application server” that is “configured for responding to HTTP requests”), the method comprising:

- an *XML* document (see Paragraph 0010 – Vange teaches this limitation in that the prior art includes methods of database access that involve web designers creating HTML documents that are converted to XML and stored on a web server); and
- generating a first hypertext markup language (HTML) document, based on the retrieved XML document (see Paragraphs 0010, 0051 and 0066 – Vange teaches this limitation in that the database service system uses XML and HTML user-level protocols to exchange information with client devices),

for the purpose of increasing the functionality of databases (see Paragraph 0010).

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method, disclosed in Miloslavsky, to include:

- an XML document that specifies for a user, a call number of a second party; and
- generating a first hypertext markup language (HTML) document, based on the retrieved XML document,

for the purpose of increasing the functionality of databases, as taught by Vange.

Claim 2:

Miloslavsky discloses a stored document that includes a call number of the user and a prompt sequence for accessing the second party, the first HTML document including the prompt sequence and the second HTML document including the call number of the user (see Column 15, Lines 41-59 – Miloslavsky discloses this limitation in that the call center system allows the user to request a callback via the web page; the “stored document” includes the user’s call number in that the user’s telephone number was previously stored in a cookie; the “stored document” includes a “prompt sequence for accessing the second party” in that the web page includes a button that allows the user to either call the call center or request a callback; the “first HTML document” includes the “prompt sequence” in that the web page includes the aforementioned button; the “second HTML document” includes the call number of the user in that it connects the user to the call center).

Claim 6:

Miloslavsky discloses a method in an application server for executing a voice application (see Figure 5; see Column 2, Line 66 through Column 3, Line 11; see Column 39, Lines 25-51 – Miloslavsky discloses this limitation in that the call center system involves Internet protocol network telephony and every computerized method performed on the Internet is *inherently* “in an application server”), the method comprising:

- receiving an HTTP request requesting a voice application from a user, the voice application being specified in a document including information for connecting with a call number of the user with a call number of a second party (see Figures 5, 6 and 8; see Column 10, Lines 57-62; Column 11, Lines 17-36; see Column 12, Line 44 through Column 13, Line 16 – Miloslavsky discloses this limitation in that the call center system includes a document that connects the user with the call center; when the user requests the web page, via an “HTTP request,” the call center system presents the web page to the user; the web page presented to a user “specifies the voice application” in that it includes the instructions for connecting the user with the call center after the user clicks on the button; the web page includes “information for connecting with a call number of the user with a call number of a second party” in that the user is connected to the call center after the user clicks on the button);
- generating a first hypertext markup language (HTML) document having instructions including the call number for accessing the second party (see

Figures 5, 6 and 8; see Column 10, Lines 57-62; Column 11, Lines 17-36; see Column 12, Line 44 through Column 13, Line 16 – Miloslavsky discloses this limitation in that the call center system displays the web page on the user's browser; the web page includes "instructions for accessing the second party" in that the call center system will connect the user to the call center whenever the user clicks on the button); and

- selectively generating a second HTML document, based on a prescribed input received from the second party, having instructions for connecting the second party with the user (see Figures 5, 6 and 8; see Column 10, Lines 57-62; Column 11, Lines 17-36; Column 11, Lines 17-34; see Column 12, Line 44 through Column 13, Line 16; Column 14, Lines 32-64; Column 31, Lines 6-10; Column 39, Lines 25-51 – Miloslavsky discloses this limitation in that the call center system connects the user to the call center; Miloslavsky discloses "selectivity" based on "input received from the second party" in two ways: 1) the service request process determines to which agent the call is directed; and 2) the agent telephone is capable of placing a call on hold to answer another call; Miloslavsky discloses "generating a second HTML document" in that the invention may operate via computers that simulate telephones per Internet protocol network telephony).

Miloslavsky fails to expressly disclose:

- an *XML* document that specifies a voice application; and

- generating a first hypertext markup language (HTML) document, *based on the XML document*.

Vange teaches a method in an application server for executing a voice application (see Paragraphs 0027, 0031 and 0038 – Vange teaches this limitation in that the database service system involves voice over Internet protocol services and every computerized method performed on the Internet is *inherently* “in an application server”), the method comprising:

- an XML document (see Paragraph 0010 – Vange teaches this limitation in that the prior art includes methods of database access that involve web designers creating HTML documents that are converted to XML and stored on a web server); and
- generating a first hypertext markup language (HTML) document, based on the XML document (see Paragraphs 0010, 0051 and 0066 – Vange teaches this limitation in that the database service system uses XML and HTML user-level protocols to exchange information with client devices),

for the purpose of increasing the functionality of databases (see Paragraph 0010).

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method, disclosed in Miloslavsky, to include:

- an XML document that specifies a voice application; and

Art Unit: 2179

- generating a first hypertext markup language (HTML) document, based on the XML document,

for the purpose of increasing the functionality of databases, as taught by Vange.

Claim 7:

Claim 7 includes limitations recited in Claim 2. Thus, Miloslavsky discloses every limitation of Claim 7, as indicated in the above rejection for Claim 2.

Claim 11:

Miloslavsky discloses an application server system for developing an executable voice application (see Figure 5; see Column 2, Line 66 through Column 3, Line 11; see Column 39, Lines 25-51 – Miloslavsky discloses this limitation in that the call center system involves Internet protocol network telephony), the system comprising:

- an application runtime environment configured for generating a first hypertext markup language (HTML) document, the first HTML document having instructions including a call number for accessing a second party (see Figures 5, 6 and 8; see Column 10, Lines 57-62; Column 11, Lines 17-36; see Column 12, Line 44 through Column 13, Line 16 – Miloslavsky discloses these limitations in that the call center system operates in a client-server environment and displays the web page on the user's browser; the web page includes "instructions for accessing the second party" in that the call center system will connect the user to the call center whenever the user clicks on the button), and the application

runtime environment generating a second HTML document based on a prescribed input received from the second party, the second HTML document having instructions for connecting the second party with a user (see Figures 5, 6 and 8; see Column 10, Lines 57-62; Column 11, Lines 17-36; Column 11, Lines 17-34; see Column 12, Line 44 through Column 13, Line 16; Column 14, Lines 32-64; Column 31, Lines 6-10; Column 39, Lines 25-51 – Miloslavsky discloses this limitation in that the call center system connects the user to the call center; Miloslavsky discloses “input received from the second party” in two ways: 1) the service request process determines to which agent the call is directed; and 2) the agent telephone is capable of placing a call on hold to answer another call; Miloslavsky discloses “generating a second HTML document” in that the invention may operate via computers that simulate telephones per Internet protocol network telephony); and

- a storage medium configured for storing the document (see Figure 5; see Column 10, Lines 36-56 – Miloslavsky discloses this limitation in that the call center system includes a server on which the web page is stored).

Miloslavsky fails to expressly disclose:

- an *XML* document.

Vange teaches an application server system for developing an executable voice application (see Paragraphs 0027, 0031 and 0038 – Vange teaches this limitation in

Art Unit: 2179

that the database service system involves voice over Internet protocol services), the method comprising:

- an XML document (see Paragraph 0010 – Vange teaches this limitation in that the prior art includes methods of database access that involve web designers creating HTML documents that are converted to XML and stored on a web server),

for the purpose of increasing the functionality of databases (see Paragraph 0010).

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method, disclosed in Miloslavsky, to include:

- a first HTML document based on an XML document,

for the purpose of increasing the functionality of databases, as taught by Vange.

Claim 12:

Miloslavsky discloses an application runtime environment that is configured to insert an application parameter into an XML page prior to generating the HTML documents (the examiner notes that this limitation is not positively recited because it recites that the environment is “**configured to**” perform a function; thus, the limitation is extremely broad; Miloslavsky discloses this limitation in that the call center system involves a web page on a computer system and a user with a computer, and this

environment is “**configured to** insert an application parameter into an XML web page prior to generating the HTML documents” because the website developer had the tools to design the call center system to work this way).

Claim 13:

Miloslavsky discloses an application runtime environment that is configured for sending the first HTML document specifying a blank form for creation of an XML document in response to an initial HTTP request specifying creation of the XML document (the examiner notes that this limitation is not positively recited because it recites that the environment is “**configured for**” performing a function; thus, the limitation is extremely broad; Miloslavsky discloses this limitation in that the call center system involves a web page on a computer system and a user with a computer, and this environment is “**configured for** sending the first HTML document specifying a blank form for creation of an XML document in response to an initial HTTP request specifying creation of the XML document” because the website developer had the tools to design the call center system to work this way).

Claim 16:

Miloslavsky discloses an application server for executing a voice application (see Figure 5; see Column 2, Line 66 through Column 3, Line 11; see Column 39, Lines 25-51 – Miloslavsky discloses this limitation in that the call center system involves Internet

protocol network telephony and every computerized method performed on the Internet is inherently "in an application server"), the application server comprising:

- means for storing, in response to a first HTTP request, a document that specifies for a user, a call number of a second party (see Figures 5, 6 and 8; see Column 10, Lines 57-62; Column 11, Lines 17-36; see Column 12, Line 44 through Column 13, Line 16 – Miloslavsky discloses this limitation in that the call center system includes a server storing a document that includes the call number of the call center; this document must inherently have been placed on the server "in response to a first HTTP request" in that the website developer generated the web page that included the call center number and then published the web page by sending it to the server using HTTP);
- means for generating a first hypertext markup language (HTML) document having instructions including the call number for accessing the second party (see Figures 5, 6 and 8; see Column 10, Lines 57-62; Column 11, Lines 17-36; see Column 12, Line 44 through Column 13, Line 16 – Miloslavsky discloses this limitation in that the call center system displays the web page on the user's browser; the web page includes "instructions for accessing the second party" in that the call center system will connect the user to the call center whenever the user clicks on the button); and
- means for selectively generating a second HTML document, based on a prescribed input received from the second party, having instructions for connecting the second party with the user (see Figures 5, 6 and 8; see Column

10, Lines 57-62; Column 11, Lines 17-36; Column 11, Lines 17-34; see Column 12, Line 44 through Column 13, Line 16; Column 14, Lines 32-64; Column 31, Lines 6-10; Column 39, Lines 25-51 – Miloslavsky discloses this limitation in that the call center system connects the user to the call center; Miloslavsky discloses “selectivity” based on “input received from the second party” in two ways: 1) the service request process determines to which agent the call is directed; and 2) the agent telephone is capable of placing a call on hold to answer another call; Miloslavsky discloses “generating a second HTML document” in that the invention may operate via computers that simulate telephones per Internet protocol network telephony).

Miloslavsky fails to expressly disclose:

- an *XML* document that specifies for a user, a call number of a second party; and
- generating a first hypertext markup language (HTML) document, *based on the retrieved XML document*.

Vange teaches an application server for executing a voice application (see Paragraphs 0027, 0031 and 0038 – Vange teaches this limitation in that the database service system involves voice over Internet protocol services and every computerized method performed on the Internet is *inherently* “in an application server”), the application server comprising:

- an XML document (see Paragraph 0010 – Vange teaches this limitation in that the prior art includes methods of database access that involve web designers creating HTML documents that are converted to XML and stored on a web server); and
 - generating a first hypertext markup language (HTML) document, based on the retrieved XML document (see Paragraphs 0010, 0051 and 0066 – Vange teaches this limitation in that the database service system uses XML and HTML user-level protocols to exchange information with client devices),
- for the purpose of increasing the functionality of databases (see Paragraph 0010).

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the application server, disclosed in Miloslavsky, to include:

- an XML document that specifies for a user, a call number of a second party; and
 - generating a first hypertext markup language (HTML) document, based on the retrieved XML document,
- for the purpose of increasing the functionality of databases, as taught by Vange.

Claims 5 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miloslavsky, in view of Vange, and further in view of Casellini, U.S. Patent No. 6,404,860.

Claim 5:

As indicated in the above discussion, Miloslavsky, in view of Vange, discloses/teaches every element of Claim 1.

Miloslavsky, in view of Vange, fails to expressly disclose/teach:

- playing a voice message indicating to the second party that the user wants to speak with the second party.

Casellini teaches a method for managing calls through the Internet (see Column 1, Lines 5-9 – Casellini teaches this limitation, as clearly indicated in the cited text), comprising:

- playing a voice message indicating to the second party that the user wants to speak with the second party (see Column 4, Lines 16-64 – Casellini teaches this limitation in that the call management system allows the subscriber to reply to the caller by entering a text message that is read to the caller; also, the caller may leave a voice mail requesting a callback from the subscriber),

for the purpose of allowing the parties to communicate with each other (see Column 2, Lines 12-23).

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method, disclosed in Miloslavsky, in view of Vange, to include:

Art Unit: 2179

- an XML document that specifies for a user, a call number of a second party; and
- generating a first hypertext markup language (HTML) document, based on the retrieved XML document,

for the purpose of increasing the functionality of databases, as taught by Vange.

Claim 10:

Claim 10 corresponds to Claim 5. Thus, Miloslavsky, in view of Vange, and further in view of Casellini, discloses/teaches every limitation of Claim 10, as indicated in the above rejection for Claim 5.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 3, 4, 8, 9, 14 and 15 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Also, the objections to the claims must be satisfactorily addressed.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

Claims 3, 8 and 14:

The prior art fails to disclose or suggest a method that allows a user to make a VOIP phone call using an HTML form that includes entry fields into which a user specifies the user's call number, the call number of the second party and the prompt

sequence for accessing the second party, subsequently store that information into an XML document along with instructions for executing voice application operations and later use that XML document to connect the user to the second party.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to Claims 1-16 have been considered but are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure: Tebeka et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,473,423; Zhao et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,529,501; Danner et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,711,618; Eastep et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,731,625; Gifford et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2003/0123622; Dodrill et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,738,803; and Casellini, U.S. Patent No. 6,404,860.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Doug Hutton whose telephone number is (571) 272-4137. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:00 AM to 5:00 PM.

Art Unit: 2179

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon, can be reached at (571) 272-4136. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-2100.

WDH

December 6, 2004

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'D. Hutton', with a stylized flourish at the end.

**DOUG HUTTON
PATENT EXAMINER
TECH CENTER 2100**